

Environmental
Restoration
Contractor

ERC Team

Meeting Minutes Cover Sheet

Please find attached the Open Meeting Minutes from the Groundwater/Vadose Zone Integration Project of April 2, 2001.

If you have any comments or changes to these minutes, please reply to this email and your comments will be incorporated into the next meeting minutes.

Environmental
Restoration
Contractor

ERC Team

Meeting Minutes

SUBJECT GROUNDWATER/VADOSE ZONE INTEGRATION PROJECT MEETING - APRIL 2, 2001

TO Distribution

FROM Michael J. Graham, Groundwater/Vadose Zone Integration Project Manager

DATE April 19, 2001

ATTENDEES

See Attached List

DISTRIBUTION

Attendees

GW/VZ Distribution List

Document and Information Services H0-09

NEXT GW/VZ INTEGRATION PROJECT OPEN MEETING:

Next Meeting: Monday, April 16, 2001 – 1-3 p.m.

Location: Bechtel Hanford, Inc., Assembly Room (Badging Required)

Local Call-In Number: (509) 376-7411

Toll Free Call-In Number: (800) 664-0771

MEETING MINUTES:

A Groundwater/Vadose Zone (GW/VZ) Integration Project Open Meeting was held on April 2, 2001, in Richland, Washington, at the Bechtel Hanford, Inc. (BHI) Assembly Room.

PROJECT REPORT:

Schedule Update (Michael Graham) (Attachment)

We will be meeting a milestone on *Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976* (RCRA) well drilling. The drilling has been completed and crews are doing the sampling analysis now. We also have the Integration Project Expert Panel (IPEP) coming up at the end of April. Moses Jarayssi is here today to talk about that.

Review of Upcoming Complex-Wide Vadose Zone Science and Technology Road Map Roundtable (Jan Brown, INEEL)

The draft Science and Technology roadmap has a stakeholder involvement plan. We have been working with U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) on trying to develop a better approach to public involvement. One of our goals is to start a national conversation. We want to increase the dialogue and keep the conversation going. We are excited that Shelley Cimon invited us to do a roundtable. We will start at 9 a.m. on

Monday, April 9, with introductions. Then, there will be a full hour of sharing among all the attendees. At this point, we have 32 people registered. There are eight on the team, so there will be at least 40 people in attendance. We are asking that people share their observations about the document (roadmap). We want to hear people's fears and hopes. The presenters will hear the comments and concerns of the group right off the bat. There will be a good mix of regulators, contractors, stakeholders, and Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory (INEEL) staff.

After a break, the room will be arranged in presentation-style seating. The vadose zone manager at INEEL will discuss the development of the roadmap. There are three parts to that document – the vadose zone process, characterization, and simulation and modeling. The idea is to have scientists give presentations and be available to answer questions.

In the afternoon, we will break into two groups in a question-and-answer format. By this, we hope to gain perspective on how to improve the document. One of the editors of the document will be there from Washington, D.C. After a break, we will hear final remarks and talk about possible next steps. We are very interested in how people would like to be involved and maintain on-going participation.. And we haven't been able to determine our work's relationship to long-term stewardship. There will be a meeting critique after that. The meeting format is much less formal, more conversational and oriented toward letting people vent their frustrations. We look forward to DOE representatives providing feedback on this kind of interaction.

A review draft of the agenda is coming via email and will be included in the minutes of this meeting. The second page offers biographies on the presenters, and the first page is the agenda itself.

QUESTION: How many have signed up for it so far?

ANSWER: 32, but I suspect there will be a few more. And we have eight on the team. This is a mixed group of people – a variety of citizens. We are really looking forward to this interaction.

QUESTION: I didn't quite get your drift regarding long-term stewardship. How does it relate to Hanford?

ANSWER: We don't have a pat answer. We are trying to take people's observations and find out how they see it. I turn the question back around to the participants. It's not clear yet. We need to generate a final roadmap by fall of 2001.

COMMENT: There's a workshop on stewardship in Richland being held this week.

QUESTION: Who's leading it?

ANSWER: Jim Daley of DOE-RL

QUESTION: You were working with Jim and you now have the lead?

ANSWER: INEEL is the lead site for long-term stewardship. It's still not clear if this is a headquarters. There is some concern about us doing a roundtable or talking about vadose zone because it involves so many issues. We're focusing on the roadmap and not presuming to know all the implications. We are out doing this ahead of other programs. It's a learning process. We don't want to presume that we have all the answers.

Update on meetings with DOE Headquarters and the National Academy of Sciences (Michael Graham, John Morse)

John Morse, Mike Thompson, Michael Graham, Mark Freshley, Tony Knepp, and John Zachara went to the National Academy of Sciences meeting last week in Washington, D.C., and gave the final briefing before they complete their report. The reason we took a crowd is we are at the point where all the relative information on the S-SX tank farm is all coming together. We thought it important that we tell them what we have done. Science and Technology (S&T) is supporting the S-SX tank farm. We shared a lot of information. We are also going to cover the same ground with the Integration Project Expert Panel (IPEP) at the end of the month. We had a morning with NAS, and there were a lot of good questions and dialogue. There are 11 chapters in their report; they think it will be out ahead of schedule, either in late June or July.

There is strong support of the program from the Office of Science and Technology (EM-50) and the operational people. They were very encouraging. The NAS expressed some concern about budgets and contract changes.

COMMENT (Mary Harmon): The NAS knows they also have an opportunity, if they get the document in early enough, it will help lobby congress for the 2003 budget.

QUESTION: That sounds like they didn't have much of anything negative to say about Hanford cleanup?

ANSWER: No, not really. They were generally positive. We expect a report that shows where we need to focus. Their intent is to be instructive and helpful.

COMMENT (Mary Harmon): They are trying to help make sure this program stays on target and give recognition that the site is integrating and will continue to do that. Their input will help improve our own process. It's a very constructive report.

COMMENT (Michael Graham): They did say they are going to do an out-briefing to senior DOE folks. I'd like to go to that.

Agenda for upcoming Integration Project Expert Panel Meeting (Moses Jarayssi)

A copy of the recently finalized agenda is being handed out. The IPEP wants to focus on the status and plans of the Integration Project, the future, and what we have achieved so far. On the first day, there will be the Panel Roundtable Discussion, which is new. This will allow panel members to express their views as to where they see project going in future.

On the second day of the meeting, they will focus first on Systems Assessment Capability (SAC) History Matching results. The second focus session is the S-SX Field Characterization. The leads on these issues will be discussing those items with their counterparts on the panel.

The next meeting may be as soon as June or July.

QUESTION: On the Thursday, there are two sessions on the S-SX work -- one before lunch on Field Characterization and one after lunch on Investigations. Why are the presenters different?

ANSWER: The first session will talk about data recovered so far; Tony Knepp is working that. The second session is about the support that S&T provided in the field investigation. Mark Freshley and Tony Knepp

connected with John Matuszek and John Conaway last week. This session reflects that conversation. Details will be forthcoming.

The idea is that the panel would like to step up and lead a discussion on overall perspective on the project and what we've done and where we are going.

The stakeholder and regulator session is still being worked out.

Immobilized Low-Activity Waste (ILAW) Well Drilling (Fred Mann)

We presently have a lot of waste in tanks. We retrieve it and separate it into two streams. The Immobilized Low-Activity Waste (ILAW) packages are disposed of in the 200 East Area. We finished a drilling and sampling campaign just west of the Plutonium Uranium Reduction Extraction (PUREX) site. We attempted a continuous sampling from 45 feet to the water table. In sands, we got a 90 percent sample recovery. In gravel areas it's a little more difficult to get good sample recovery. We are doing permeability tests in the gravel areas, which show how rapidly pressure decays. We did this at eight different spots and got good results. We have basically excellent soil samples -- nearly continuous. It's a good series of samples, and we have information on gravel as well. We converted the groundwater well to a monitoring well under the *Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976* (RCRA) for the ILAW disposal site. Within the next six months, the report will be out. The driller was not able to begin until March 14th, and it usually takes two weeks to do continuous sampling. They did it in a week. Everything was tremendously well planned and executed. There were no accidents and we got tremendous sampling and field measurements.

One of our principles is to rally to help each other get our work done successfully. We really try to help each other out to meet milestones. This one was a nail-biter.

QUESTION: Is vitrification of low-activity waste a done deal or is it still on the table?

ANSWER: My understanding is that it is a done deal. We are not waiting on SAC results. The ILAW 2001 Performance Assessment (PA) gives a waste disposal operational statement. We sent it to the Office of River Protection (ORP) and now the copy is back at headquarters. Hopefully, they will continue. The same PA formed the technical backbone. Ecology has to review the 1998 and 2001 PA. We received comments and incorporated those comments.

QUESTION: Did that PA compare this approach to cheaper approaches?

ANSWER: No. It is not a financial document. It's environmental. It's not obvious that any other process is cheaper. The deputy secretary in DOE reaffirmed the decision to go to vitrification.

QUESTION: Vitrification has not always been touted as the cheap way to go, but is it really?

ANSWER: Yes, that is true. We have about 55 million gallons of waste. If that waste is vitrified, it is still 55 million gallons. If one goes to grout, there is a larger volume.

COMMENT: I'm a little surprised by the result.

COMMENT (Charley Kincaid): They deferred that one would have to go back and look at the problems again. Headquarters is moving away from grout.

Grout only took care of double-shelled tanks. There has been a lot of effort on that. The decision has been made at high levels. We do look at costs. It's probable that because of the PA we will have significant cost savings.

Carbon tetrachloride investigation (Virginia Rohay)

We are planning to deepen two wells near the carbon tetrachloride disposal site at Z-9. We will stay above the caliche. This is an opportunity to investigate vapor extraction. We will be able to look below those zones and see the effect vertically. This is scheduled for early May. The vapor extraction system will be starting in early April. We will run the system at Z-1A first. We are going to drill a groundwater well in the vicinity of the Plutonium Finishing Plant to further investigate the carbon tetrachloride in the area. There is an August timeframe for that work. Under Bruce Ford, the work plan is under development to investigate those same sources. Groundwater and source projects are coordinating closely to get most information for the programs. The EM-50 program is meeting here next week, on the 11th.

COMMENT (Michael Graham): The Detailed Work Plan is in development. A significant amount of money was put in for a scope for PITT that was not well defined. Peer review came back with a recommendation not to proceed. The change package just got through U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL) to cover the activities Virginia just discussed. Carbon tetrachloride is an issue we'll hear more and more about. We are also looking at some S&T opportunities with some Environmental Management Science Program (EMSP) investigators.

QUESTION: Regarding budget issues, have you gotten any feel for what that may require for new budget?

ANSWER: The final response is back at the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). They are zeroing in on their final recommendations. DOE asked us to scope those out in general. Eleven of their comments hit right on groundwater issues.

Update on meeting with Oregon Hanford Waste Board (Steve Sautter, Moses Jarayssi)

Bob Bryce, Steve Sautter and Moses Jarayssi attended the meeting last Wednesday. Doug Hildebrand (DOE-RL) was also there providing excellent input for DOE. We were invited by Sue Safford (Oregon Office of Energy) and staff to provide an overview on SAC History Matching and IPEP, including our responses to their recommendations from the October 2000 meeting. It was a great audience with varying levels of knowledge on Hanford. We had to be as basic as possible in covering the range of knowledge to make sure there was a good understanding. It was a really good exchange of information and questions.

We discussed our activities along the river, the timing of decisions in 100 Area, and final decisions on ground water remediation. They found it unacceptable that the final decision was not going to be made until 2008. We explained some things to them and now they understand. Another topic they were interested in was impact studies on river contaminants on receptors.

QUESTION: Are there similar studies going on anywhere else?

ANSWER: There are many strontium studies being done. We need to get them together and do a gap analysis of what is there.

COMMENT (Sue Safford): I just want to thank Moses, Steve and Bob. We appreciate your patience in answering the board's questions.

UPCOMING EVENTS (Michael Graham)

There is a full Hanford Advisory Board (HAB) meeting this week. Then, the new Central Plateau/River Corridor Committee will meet April 10. This is the former HAB Environmental Restoration Committee combined with the former Health, Safety and Waste Management Committee. They will be electing new officers, reviewing the potential work plan, and assigning issue managers.

Then, we have the IPEP meeting at the end of the month.

COMMENT: I have a commendation, I think things are looking reasonably good. I hope the budget business gets worked out with out too much more stress.

RESPONSE: The objective was to get the project operational and I think we have accomplished that now. The important thing has always been that it is done safely. We have a great team of people who think before they do things. There is a lot of fieldwork going on out there. When you see a groundwater well or borehole being drilled for 12 hours a day, it is impressive to see how thorough those people are. The field-engineering group is outstanding.

There are 32 In Situ Redox Manipulation (ISRM) holes being drilled this year with injections and the 618-11 investigation has ten more boreholes.

COMMENT: The NAS committee has several risk-oriented members. I hope you are feeling pushed to give more attention to those areas that concern me.

QUESTION: Can we get a registration form for the INEEL meeting for Charlie Kilbury?

ANSWER: Yes.

QUESTION: Can somebody brief me on the upcoming contract negotiations on the replacement contract for the river corridor? How are you going to approach this contract? I hear a lot of uproar on the extended contracts for Fluor Daniel Hanford, Inc., and CH2M Hill Hanford Group, Inc. That's not in phase with the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) according to regulators.

ANSWER: Who would be the audience for this meeting?

QUESTION: A few interested people. It could provide an understanding of how you are approaching that. I realize it may be sensitive.

ANSWER: I'll check on it.

COMMENT (Mary Harmon): I'm afraid you'll be disappointed with how much information they will be able to share with you. They can get you a copy of the river corridor report, the new strategy, and the restructure done on DDS, and that's about the extent of it.

Okay, I understand. It doesn't hurt to ask.

NOTES:

GW/VZ Web Site location: <http://www.bhi-erc.com/projects/vadose>

If you have questions or comments, please contact Steve Sautter (509-372-9692) or Alison Kent (509-372-9192).

ATTACHMENTS:

- 1) GW/VZ Integration Project FY 2001 Summary Schedule
- 2) GW/VZ Integration Project Two Month Look Ahead Calendar
- 3) GW/VZ Integration Project Integration Project Expert Panel Meeting Agenda

ATTENDEES:

Marty Bensky – Tri-City Caucus

Jan Brown – INEEL (by phone)

Don Clarke – DEC

Dib Goswami - Ecology

Michael Graham – BHI

Mary Harmon – DOE-HQ (by phone)

Kathy Huss – SAIC (by phone)

Moses Jarayssi - BHI

Alison Kent – BHI

Charles Kilbury – HAB

Charley Kincaid - PNNL

Fred Mann – CHI

John Morse – DOE-RL

Gordon Rogers – HAB

Virginia Rohay - ERC

Sue Safford – Oregon Office of Energy (by phone)

Steve Sautter – BHI

John Silko – DOE-RL

Rod Skeen - CTUIR

Rob Yasek - ORP

GW/VZ INTEGRATION PROJECT
APRIL 2, 2001 – MAY 21, 2001
TWO MONTH LOOK AHEAD CALENDAR

April 2	GW/VZ Project Open Meeting BHI Assembly Room – 1-3 p.m. (Contact: Steve Sautter)
April 5-6	HAB (Red Lion Hotel, Richland, WA)
April 9	DOE Complex-Wide Vadose Zone Science and Technology Road Map Roundtable (Washington State University) 9:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.
April 10	HAB Central Plateau/River Corridor (formerly Environmental Restoration and Health, Safety & WM) Committee Meeting BHI Assembly Room – 9 a.m. - 4:30 p.m.
April 16	GW/VZ Project Open Meeting BHI Assembly Room – 1-3 p.m. (Contact: Steve Sautter)
April 25-27	IPEP Meeting (BHI Assembly Room, Richland, WA)
May 7	GW/VZ Project Open Meeting BHI Assembly Room – 1-3 p.m. (Contact: Steve Sautter)
May 21	GW/VZ Project Open Meeting BHI Assembly Room – 1-3 p.m. (Contact: Steve Sautter)

DRAFT

BECHTEL BUILDING ASSEMBLY ROOM
WEDNESDAY, April 25

Moderator

7:30 – 8:00 (AM)	On Your Own Coffee From Columbia River Coffee House	
8:00 – 8:15	Welcome and Introduction DOE-RL Welcome	E Berkey K Klein
8:15 – 9:00	Hanford Vision Update	K Klein
9:00 – 9:30)	IP : Making a Difference, Now and in the Future	Ballard, Morse
9:30 - 10:00	Open Discussion: Making a Difference, Now and in the Future	All
10:00 – 10:15	Break	
10:15 – 12:30 (PM)	IP: Status and Plans:	Graham
12:30 – 1:00	Lunch	
1:00 – 2:30	Stakeholders, Tribal Nations, and Regulators Input	Points of Contact: IPEP: Ralph Patt GW/VZ IP: <i>Jarayssi</i>
2:30 – 3:45	Panel Roundtable Discussion I	Points of Contact: IPEP: Ed Berkey GW/VZ IP: <i>M. Graham</i>
3:45 – 4:00	Break	
4:00 - 5:00	IPEP Internal Administrative Meeting	
Evening	Panel Only: Working Session #1	

BECHTEL BUILDING ASSEMBLY ROOM

THURSDAY, April 26

Moderator

7:30 – 8:00 (AM) On Your Own Coffee From Columbia River Coffee House

8:00 – 10:00 Focus Session: SAC History Matching Results:

Points of Contact:
IPEP: Randy Bassett
GW/VZ IP: *Bob Bryce*

10:00 – 10:15 Break

10:15 – 12:15 (PM) Focus Session: S-SX Field Characterization

Points of Contact:
IPEP: John Conaway
GW/VZ IP:
Tony Knepp

12:15 – 12:45 Lunch

12:45 – 2:15 Focus Session: S&T S-SX Investigations

Points of Contact:
IPEP: John Matuszek
GW/VZ IP:
Freshley

2:15 – 3:00 Stakeholders, Tribal Nations, and Regulators Input

3:00 – 3:15 BREAK

3:15 - 4:15 Panel Roundtable Discussion II

Points of Contact:
IPEP: Ed Berkey
GW/VZ IP: *M. Graham*

4:15 – 5:30 Panel Only: Working Session #2

Evening Panel Only: Working Session #3

BECHTEL BUILDING ASSEMBLY ROOM

FRIDAY, October 27

Moderator

8:00 (AM) – 1:00 (PM) Panel Only: Working Session #4

1:00 – 2:00 Closing remarks

E Berkey

2:00 – 3:00 Opportunity for Stakeholder, Tribal Nation, and Regulator Input and Comments

E Berkey

3:00 – 4:00 Panel Only: Wrap-up Session